

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 27, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note dependent claims 2-6 are indicated as being allowed. However, Applicants assume there has been a typographical error and that claims 2-6 should have been indicated as containing allowable subject, for which Applicants elect not to rewrite claims 2-6 to independent form at this time to permit the Examiner an opportunity to reconsider the rejection of claims in view of the arguments presented in this paper. Claims 1-38 are pending in the application, with claims 9-26 being withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejection of claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 8, 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,255,130, issued to Kim (hereafter "Kim"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Kim, alone, fails to teach all the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Kim fails to teach an array substrate device that includes, among other features, "a black matrix overlapping the thin film transistor, the gate line, and the data line except for a first portion of the drain electrode" and "a second pixel electrode on the color filter contacting the first pixel electrode", as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Kim further fails to teach an array substrate device having a color filter on a thin film transistor (COT) structure for use in a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, "a light-shielding pattern disposed in the non-display area and the boundary area corresponding to the gate link lines and spaces between the gate link lines", as recited in independent claim 27 of the present application.

Kim also fails to teach an array substrate device having a color filter on a thin film transistor (COT) structure for use in a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other

features, “ a light-shielding pattern disposed in the non-display area and the boundary area corresponding to spaces between the gate link lines”, as recited in independent claim 33 of the present application.

The Office Action concedes that Kim does not disclose a black matrix nor a color filter. To remedy these deficient teachings of Kim, the Office Action appears to take Official Notice by making a broad statement regarding black matrices and color filters being “common and conventional”. Applicants respectfully submit the fact that a black matrix or color filter may be used in a device does not render the combined features recited in the claims of the present application obvious. In fact, the Examiner’s statements do nothing to remedy the fact that Kim, alone, fails to teach the structure recited in the claims of the present application. Further, Applicants submit “[I]t is never appropriate to rely solely on common knowledge in the art without evidentiary support in the record as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based.” (MPEP § 2144.03(E)) Should this basis of rejection and motivation for modifying Kim be maintained, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to provide documentary evidence to support the rejection in the next Office Action.

Because Kim and no combination of the general statements regarding the black matrix and color filter would provide the combined features discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 7 and 33, Applicants respectfully submit independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 7-8, independent claim 27 and its dependent claim 28, and independent claim 33 and its dependent claim 34 are allowable over Kim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 29-32 and 35-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants elect not to rewrite these claims to independent form at this time to permit the Examiner and opportunity to reconsider the objection and rejection in view of the remarks presented in this paper.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Application No.: 10/724,892
Amendment dated June 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated March 27, 2006

Docket No.: 8734.263 US

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant